

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims, by incorporating claim 22 as filed into paragraph [0041], to address the Examiner's objection. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-15, and 17-22 have been amended, claim 16 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-15, and 17-22 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:**

Claims 1-6, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's interpretation, in view of the inherent operating environment of task handlers of a hybrid device controlled by a function key, claims 1 and 21 have been amended, so as to incorporate additional ties to machines used in the methods, without narrowing the scope thereof. With regard to claim 22, Applicants note that the Examiner has not provided a definition of a computer readable medium that would encompass a carrier wave, as would be understood to one of skill in the art. However, in order to clarify the medium in view of the examples recited in paragraph [0041], claim 22 has been amended to recite a computer readable recording medium.

Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 have been amended, in order to remedy the alleged indefiniteness. Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,422). In particular, the Examiner asserts that Nelson teaches all aspects of the rejected claims.

In order to even more particularly point out the aspects of the present invention, claim 1 has been amended, so as to recite that the receiving, changing, and storing operations are

performed in the hybrid device, and to recite that the priorities of the task-handlers relate to an order in which the task handlers are individually and selectively controlled, by the operation of the function key. In addition, claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 have been amended to recite that the operation of each of the task handlers in a hybrid device is selectively and individually controlled by the operation of the function key, according to the priorities of the task-handlers.

Nelson is directed to a programmable universal remote control, where a number of different commands can be assigned to a function key and stored in the remote control. When the function key is pressed, all of the commands are executed to control devices that correspond to the commands (col. 7, lines 15-47). Therefore, the function key cannot be said to individually and selectively control the execution of the commands.

Present claim 1 recites that the priorities of task-handlers in a hybrid device are changed and stored in the hybrid device, rather than in the remote control (input unit), as is taught in Nelson. In addition, Nelson fails to teach or disclose changing the priorities of the task-handlers, such that the operations of the task handlers can be selectively and individually controlled by the operation of the function key, as recited in present claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22, because Nelson teaches that the commands assigned to a function key are all executed, whenever the function key is operated. In addition, the commands are sent to corresponding separate devices having the task handlers, as opposed to being sent to a single device having multiple task handlers.

Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN MCEWEN, LLP

Date:

7/22/09

By:



Matthew T. Gill  
Registration No. 48,490

1400 Eye St., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510